

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
(Attorney Docket No. 17403US05)

)  
In the Application of: )  
                            )     Electronically Filed  
                            MacInnis         )  
                            )     Date: September 29, 2008  
                            Serial No. 10/763,087         )  
                            )  
                            Filed: 1/22/2004         )  
                            )  
                            Examiner: Hassan         )  
                            )  
                            Group Art Unit: 2182         )  
                            )  
                            Confirmation: 6408         )  
                            )  
                            )

**REQUEST FOR PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE REVIEW**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Request for Pre-Appeal Conference Review is  
accompanied with a Notice of Appeal in response to the  
Final Office Action of 6/27/2008.

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 4-11 are presently pending and stand rejected. Preappeal review of the rejections of claims 4, 6, 9, and 10 are respectfully requested.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Hook. Claim 4 recites, among other limitations, "wherein the memory request arbiter performs real time scheduling of memory requests from different devices having different priorities..." .

Examiner has indicated that Van Hook teaches "wherein the memory request arbiter performs real time scheduling of memory requests from different devices having different priorities, the unified memory system provides for real time scheduling of tasks (real time scheduling of tasks in task list, figure 8, column 21, lines 9-36".

Assignee respectfully traverses because Van Hook does not teach "wherein the memory request arbiter performs real time scheduling of memory requests from different devices having *different priorities*...". Assignee notes that although Figure 8 shows a "task list", reference 250, Figure 8, nor column 21, lines 9-36 discuss the priorities of the task, much less that they have "different priorities".

Moreover, Van Hook, column 5, line 63 - column 6, line 9 does NOT indicate that "video data and tasks associate therein have the high priority whereas the audio data and tasks have lower priority".

Column 5, Line 63 - Column 6, Line 9 states:

System 50 is capable of processing, interactively in real time, a digital representation or model of a three-dimensional world to display the world (or portions of it) from any arbitrary viewpoint within the world. For example, system 50 can

interactively change the viewpoint in response to real time inputs from game controllers 86. This can permit, for example, the game player to see the world through the eyes of a "virtual person" who moves through the world, and looks and goes wherever the game players commands him or her to go. This capability of displaying quality 3D images interactively in real time can create very realistic and exciting game play."

The foregoing paragraph does not even mention audio priority. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection and requests that the rejection to claim 4 and dependent claims 5-11 be withdrawn.

Claim 6 recites, among other limitations "wherein said predetermined minimum interval is long enough for another device to access". Examiner has indicated that Van Hook teaches "a predetermined minimum interval between subsequent accesses by a device is enforced, and wherein said predetermine minimum interval is long enough for another device to access (subsequent access are delayed by a predetermined pipeline delay between processes, column 37, lines 7-30, the predetermine delay is inherently characterized by the pipeline and clock)."

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection. As an initial matter, column 37, lines 7-30 does not even discuss a pipeline. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that "wherein said predetermined minimum interval is long enough for another device to access" does not read on the "delayed by a predetermined pipeline delay between processes". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 6.

Claim 9 recites, among other limitations, "make high priority service requests through the circuit component."

Claim 10 recites, among other limitations, "further

comprising a round robin server for handling low priority tasks.

Examiner has made reference to Van Hook, DMA request from 210, Figure 6A to reject claim 9, and DMA requests from 208, figure 6a to reject claim 10. In Van Hook, reference 208 corresponds to "Audio Interface" while 210 corresponds to "Video Interface". There is no teaching that the "DMA request from 210" has any higher priority relative to "DMA request from 208", or that "DMA request from 208" has any lower priority relative to "DMA request from 210" Moreover, with respect to claim 10, Assignee respectfully traverses that "DMA requests from 208" are "a round robin server". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 9 and 10.

## **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted



Mirut Dalal  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 44,052

September 29, 2008

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison - Suite 3400  
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000  
FAX (312) 775-8100